Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1323 M STREET, WASHINGTON 5, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. IV, NO. 28, *Issue Number* 180, JULY 9, 1947 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

PROSPECTS IN SPAIN

by Richard Pattee

Three factors support the conclusion, inescapable since the referendum of July 6, that there is no real prospect of any political change in Spain today.

The first of these factors is the terror of the overwhelming mass of the Spanish people at the very idea of revolution or a return to the agony of the civil war. To many the term republic has become synonymous with the chaos and breakdown of all public order that characterized the last years of the Second Republic.

Realistic Spaniards, even those who are out of sympathy with the Franco regime, console themselves with the belief that Spain is an oasis, in Europe today, where peace, order and productive activity reign. The Republic to many Spaniards means the re-establishment of conflicting political parties, the endless bickering of a parliament and possibly the return of political leaders long since forgotten by the public opinion of the nation.

The so-called Republican regime abroad is regarded by Spaniards of all political opinions as a shadowy, unrealistic creation with no roots in the domestic soil. The leader of this fictitious government in exile was an obscure secondary school inspector during the later period of the Republic, without substantial following or prestige.

Moreover, it is extremely important to take into account the psychological atmosphere of present-day Spain. The forces of the Republic -- ranging from Anarchists and Communists to the Basque Separatists -- were beaten in a civil war. It is not likely that eight years later an easy transition can be made back to the system that lost the war.

To Americans, so strongly conditioned against anything that is not a republic, it may seem strange to assert that Spain has never been basically republican. But the story of the advent of the first Spanish Republic, and the events that preceded the exit of Alfonso XIII in April of 1931 to prepare the way for the second, reveal with striking eloquence that republicanism has always been essentially a minority school of thought in Spain.

Copyright 1947 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The idea of a parliamentary republic with a delicate balance between essentially moderate political parties is something alien to the whole tradition of Spain. The passion and emotion of its history testify to the fact that moderation is not one of the national virtues, nor is rigid self-control in the face of opposition a dominant note under any of the regimes the country has known.

II

The second factor to militate against any immediate change is the tremendous foreign pressure focussed on the Franco regime. No serious Spaniard has ever thought of the Franco government as anything but transitory. The mere fact that Spain has been called for the past eight years the Estado Espanol, or Spanish State, is indicative of lack of permanence for the present administration.

Nevertheless, the violent attacks on the regime by other governments, the long winded airing of the "Spanish case" before the United Nations and the hostility of such near-by countries as France have all contributed to consolidating the regime, and to blocking the natural tendency toward evolution. The plain truth is that the Franco regime has changed enormously since 1938. The influence and place of the Falange are far less than at the conclusion of the war. The persecution of political enemies has virtually ceased and a certain relaxation of numerous restrictions is evident in almost every aspect of Spanish life.

This process would naturally have gone on until a peaceful transition could have been made to a more permanent regime. Foreign opposition and the tension under which Spain has lived for the past few years have led to a sort of "freezing" of the present state of affairs. The Caudillo found himself in a position which made it impossible for him to abandon power without seeming to succumb to outside pressure. The Spanish people have undoubtedly rallied to the regime in its hour of stress precisely because of the universal resentment at the attempted dictation from abroad.

The Spanish press, as well as comment in the street, shows that the average citizen is puzzled and amazed that Spain should be so bitterly attacked for so-called sins which to everyone's knowledge are being committed with tenfold greater intensity in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland and every other country dominated by the Soviet Union. This irritation at foreign interference arouses in the average Spaniard one of the strongest emotions possible; inordinate pride in running his own business and extreme sensitivity to being pushed around from outside. There is no question that the pressure from outside has strengthened Franco.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The third factor that has contributed to diminishing the prospect for a change is the decision of the regime itself to declare the monarchy restored. The Caudillo proclaimed this intention some time ago. The Spanish Cortes early in June approved the proposed law of succession and on June 10 the press announced that the proposal would be submitted to a universal plebiscite, held on July 6, to the end that the Spanish people might express their wishes in the matter.

According to this law Spain becomes a monarchy but does not have a king. The text of the law reads:

> "Article 1. Spain as a political entity is a Catholic, representative state and in accordance with its tradition, is declared a monarchy.
>
> "Article 2. The leadership of the State belongs to the Caudillo of Spain, and leader of the crusade, General Francisco Franco Bahamonde."

Succeeding articles of the law provide for a Regency which shall aid the Chief of State and at the same time assume the executive authority in the event of his death or incapacity. Two other articles clarify the matter of the immediate succession:

> "Article 6. At any time, the Chief of State may propose to the Cortes the name of the person to succeed him either as King or as Regent, according to the conditions demanded by law.
>
> "Article 7. In the event of the death or incapacity of the Chief of State, the Council of the Regency shall assume his powers temporarily until the designated successor shall have taken the oath of office."

The new law then makes it clear that the proposed monarchy is not absolute, since any successor will be obliged to accept certain basic precepts of the Spanish State, including the existence of the Cortes, etc.

The referendum of July 6 on the law of succession offered no alternative to General Franco, but asked the electorate a fairly-worded question:

> "Do you ratify with your vote the law of succession to the post of Chief of State as approved by Parliament on June 7, 1947?"

As reported by the Associated Press, "a tendency to underestimate the strength of the regime and its propaganda upset the calculations of many prognosticators who had foreseen a comparatively light vote." Preliminary figures indicate that nearly 90 per cent of the electorate cast ballots, with the affirmative vote running above ten to one.

Objective American reporters further note that "the voting itself" -- as distinct from pre-election pressures -- "was secret and free. Many of those who voted against the succession law had no hesitancy in saying so." In other words Franco, like Peron in Argentina, benefitted from the foreign campaign against him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem of the immediate restoration of the monarchy has been hopelessly complicated by the differences between Don Juan, the obvious successor, and General Franco. The plain fact is that in Spain today it is too much to expect that Franco will automatically step aside in favor of any successor regardless of his willingness to carry on the tradition of the victorious Movimiento Nacional. Or, to express the idea in cruder terms, Franco won the war and holds all the cards. Any pretender to the throne will have to play ball with Franco or he will not get the job. Don Juan, in recent declarations, has revealed himself quite recalcitrant in this respect.

After the lesson of the July 6 referendum it is important to face up to the realities in Spain. Franco holds all the key positions. The army is with him. The great mass of peasants and the middle class undoubtedly support him. There is no evidence whatever of his overthrow unless the Great Powers, namely the United States and Great Britain, decide to strangle the country economically. Nevertheless, Spaniards are preoccupied with what will happen after Franco. On every hand one hears this expression of concern. How is Spain to move peacefully into a more normal state of affairs without provoking bloodshed and revolution?

The outlook at the moment is simple. Franco will continue indefinitely until in his own good time and his own judgment he feels that he can relinquish power and install a king. If foreign pressure is eased and Spain is given a breathing spell, there is every reason to hope that this transition will not be a matter of a remote and unpredictable future. Of one thing we may be absolutely sure; constant needling and harassing of the regime will not produce anything but a hardening of the determination to endure and to resist.

Actual foreign intervention would merely precipitate a civil war, far more violent than the last. The only organized opposition in Spain, ready and willing to respond to outside aid, is that of the Communists. It is not over-simplification to assert that the greatest service the outside Powers could render Spain and the solution of her complex political problem is to let her strictly alone.

* * * * *

The above Analysis by Mr. Pattee, recognized authority on Spanish-American problems, was airmailed to HUMAN EVENTS from Madrid. It acquires additional importance because of the "provisional" exclusion of Franco Spain from the Western European bloc.

Reproduction or quotation is permitted only when credit is given to HUMAN EVENTS. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective. Address all correspondence to: HUMAN EVENTS, 1323 M Street, WASHINGTON 5, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events VOL. IV, NO. 28

By Frank C. Hanighen July 9, 1947

Democratic Party strategy in coming months will probably be based on exploitation of the Labor issue. Around Democratic Headquarters in the Mayflower Hotel it is the opinion that the President, by his veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, has checkmated Wallace's moves to lead American Labor. Therefore, further courting of the Labor vote is called for. Truman, it is reported, will address a big union rally at Soldiers' Field, Chicago, on Labor Day. The speech will mark the opening of a campaign to woo Labor.

These plans do not appeal to all the party sages. It is objected that whatever is gained on the Left of the Party will be lost on the Right. The disapproving attitude of the Southern bloc can, of course, be discounted; it always comes through on election day, in any case. But, since the passing of Roosevelt, Right Wing Democrats in various northern states have shown signs of life and hope. In some states they nourish hopes of utilizing divisions in Republican Party ranks in order to regain local power. The veto of the Labor bill has chilled some of this Right Wing enthusiasm; a pro-Labor campaign would extinguish it.

The Republicans, when they perceived the outlines of the Democratic strategy, were tempted to join battle on the Labor issue. But the more cautious heads (Speaker Joe Martin is one of them) suggested that it would be better to leave that issue alone. Active campaigning on this matter might lose some Labor votes which the Republicans hope to retain. Better, it was urged, let Truman's speeches in behalf of Labor drive middle-of-the-roaders and northern conservative Democrats into the Republican camp. A politically sounder strategy would be to attack Truman's veto of the tax bill vigorously and continuously. If the President repeats this veto then the Republicans should redouble their efforts: "Keep passing it until it wins." If this course is followed, it is promised, the Republicans will have identified themselves with the tax cut so closely that Truman can reap no credit when, next year, he relents on the matter. "High Tax Harry" may prove a very damaging epithet.

* * * * *

Some gloomy views have been aired in the discussion of the Marshall proposal. Assuming that the preliminaries of European acceptance and listing of needs are successfully concluded, and that Congress provides sufficient appropriations, the result may be good business but not for a free economy.

Dr. John H. Williams, Vice-President of the New York Federal Reserve Bank properly likens the Marshall proposal to lend-lease. But, it is recalled, lend-lease ran into a difficult period towards the end of the summer of 1941, following an initial boom. Consumers enjoying new buying power were purchasing long-coveted goods and the efforts to supply refrigerators, radios, autos, etc., came into conflict with the drive to make guns and planes for export. Competition for industrial materials was keen and the fight for brass and steel between consumer goods industries and war industries became proverbial. Shortages hampered many plants in both categories. The President appealed for a curb on installment buying. And a fearsome alphabet agency, SPAB (Supply Priorities and Allocation Board) sought to eliminate chaos. Then Pearl Harbor came, with its final decision against the consumer.

Some of these conditions can be envisioned if the new "lend-lease" goes into operation. Already, as a matter of fact, the contest between exports and the domestic market is bolstering prices to the detriment of the consumer's pocketbook. Already, there is talk of the necessity for "priorities." What the average man -- who next year will become the much courted average voter -- will say, if goods so

Copyright 1947 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long denied by war and readjustment are again curtailed by Government directives, is a matter to be pondered both by politicians and economists.

Dr. Leverett S. Lyon, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee that America, in the course of fighting Communism, is doing it with food from people's tables, clothes from their backs and lumber needed for their housing. All of this, he pointed out, makes for higher prices and is in effect an indirect form of taxes. Our exports, he warned, have imposed such an economic burden on the country that Congress might shortly have to consider reimposition of rationing, especially of some foodstuffs.

* * * * *

French Foreign Minister Bidault has discredited the epigram "France has sat on the fence so long that iron has entered her soul." Ever since Liberation, the French Government had persistently straddled international policy, seeking to play the middle between Moscow on the one hand, and London and Washington on the other. Last week, France got down from the fence and made an unequivocal choice. Bidault joined Bevin in support of the Marshall proposal. France is now openly committed to the Western bloc, regardless of Molotov's strictures.

Since this Western grouping could not have been successfully created without France, the latter will have no little influence on the bloc's future development in Europe. In the past, France has viewed the rebuilding of German industry with suspicion and French obstruction to Anglo-American economic measures has been an important factor in preventing a German recovery. Since the rehabilitation of the Ruhr must be the foundation of a unified Western Europe, the attitude of the Quai d'Orsay will be closely watched. Continuing French nationalism could gravely handicap this essential development in European recovery; alternatively, a new French spirit of co-operation could speed its progress.

A great deal depends on how firmly Premier Ramadier wields power. While the French Socialist leader has in the past week won votes of confidence both from his party and from Parliament, he must reckon on trouble from the Communists. The latter in the past have adeptly exploited anti-German feelings; there is no reason why they should not continue to work this evil. With their control of Labor unions, they can further weaken French economy by inspiring further strikes. As the largest party in the Chamber, the Red deputies enjoy a powerful advantage in the calculated exploitation of partisan politics. The multiparty system in France lends itself to such maneuvering. The French Government has indeed set its course "Against A Sea Of Troubles," as Felix Morley said in HUMAN EVENTS of May 14.

* * * * *

Observers on Capitol Hill believe that a little-noticed subcommittee, very recently appointed, may provide newspapers with copy of far more interest to the average man than that from Lake Success, Moscow or Hollywood. It is a House of Representatives group, headed by Ralph W. Gwinn of New York, formed to investigate racketeering and monopoly in housing and construction. It will inquire into material and Labor costs, and questionable practices relating to the economics of housing and construction; and will consider numerous petitions for the elimination of abuses that are paralyzing the building business. The claim that union bricklayers now lay only 500 bricks a day as compared with 2500 bricks some years ago will be investigated; as well as other examples of "feather-bedding." Its report will seek to show the extent to which such monopoly practices raise the cost of constructing homes.

* * * * *

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soon after Liberation, the Czechoslovak Government nationalized the world famous Bata shoe factory at Zlin. Mr. Jan A. Bata, who built up this extraordinary mass production plant, now lives in exile in Brazil. A copy of a letter from him addressed to the Czech Minister of Finance over a year ago has been in our possession for a long time, but nonetheless is timely today. It contains some impressive protests against the deterioration of the Zlin concern. It is true that Bata, who has been dispossessed from his ownership, hardly speaks as a dispassionate witness. But his criticisms of "the cancer of national administration," as he calls it, correspond to other reports on this spreading disease. Mr. Bata says:

"Go to Zlin, to see for yourself what has become of the glorious Czechoslovak enterprise in 10 months of the National Management. You will see the truth in the balance sheets, as follows:

"(1) The National Administration has wasted all of the reserves gathered for the purpose of reconstruction of bombarded factories by legal director-shareholders. How much? One billion Czech crowns of ready cash.

"(2) The National Administration has borrowed 300 millions.

"(3) They kicked out the shareholders-directors, put many of them in jail, till their health gave way, and all of the 2000 "know-hows," leading men, who have grown up into their positions.

"(4) The National Administration has raised the prices so that they have gone beyond the reach of the population. Farmers complain that whereas they were able to buy four pairs of shoes for a 100 kilogram sack of wheat formerly, now they can buy only one pair of the cheapest sort.

"(5) They have even spoiled the morale of the workers. According to the factory paper they need up to four times more workers to turn out the same amount of production."

* * * * *

From time to time, articles appear in the daily press reporting that the Germans feel no remorse for the crimes of the Nazi government, that they pity themselves for their troubles, show no gratitude to America for feeding them and "whine" against our Occupation Government. One of these pieces, by Charles P. Arnot, of the United Press, appeared July 5 in the Washington Daily News. It will probably not be answered by another viewpoint -- such rebuttals are rare. Therefore, it seems fitting to quote from a statement by Dr. Max Rheinstein, Professor of Law in the University of Chicago, who spent eighteen months with Military Government in the American Occupation Zone in Germany. Since Dr. Rheinstein came to this country as a refugee from Hitler's terror, no one can accuse him of sympathy for the Third Reich. The following appeared in "Foreign Notes," published by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations.

"They [the Germans] know that this situation [the economic breakdown of Germany] has been created by Hitler and they are conscious of their own share of responsibility in having made possible the Hitler regime. That they refrain from continuously confessing that guilt is not 'morbid pride or self-pity' but an understandable and sound instinct of self-preservation. If anything would be morbid, it would be that continuous repetition of self-accusation, which Thomas Mann and other 'liberals' would obviously like to hear from them every day. Even though the Germans are keeping their self-reproaches to themselves, they know that it was a German government which has brought general misery upon the world, that many of the effects of this catastrophe are irreparable and that a good many others can be removed only as the world gradually recuperates from the chaos created by the Nazis. However, they also know that the effects are aggravated by Military Government and that some alleviation of the German situation and, through it, of world conditions, could be brought about by changes in Military Government practices."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

American Communism, by James Oneal and A. G. Werner, New York:

E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., $5.00

At the height of the great Coolidge boom Mr. James Oneal wrote a history of Communist activity and influence in the United States, a subject that seemed then, alas, of little interest and less importance to the great bulk of Americans. Now with the assistance of Dr. A. G. Werner this history has been extensively revised, brought up to date and republished under the title American Communism. It is a pity perhaps that the revision stopped short of rewriting, for a good part of the book remains in the turgid, prolix and pedantic idiom that was fashionable among the radical publicists of twenty years ago. All the same, it is a most valuable and instructive work; I believe it fully worth the attention of anyone who wishes to understand the nature of Communist discipline, the techniques of Communist infiltration, the function and psychology of the fellow traveler, the significance of sectarian groups like the Trotskyists, Lovestonites, Loreists and so on, and the many strange convolutions of the Communist party line. Mr. Oneal is as well qualified as anybody to explain these mysteries, since he is an ancient warhorse of Socialist politics and journalism; but I dare say that Dr. Werner, who is a teacher of Russian history, has contributed some illuminations of his own.

Anyway, their thesis is that Communist tactics and operations cannot be understood until it is recognized that the American comrades have not, and can never have, any aim or program of their own, that whatever they do is done in blind obedience to the will of Moscow. This obedience is based upon a faith, mystical in its nature, that the party oracles there have the one infallible answer to the social and economic problems of the modern world, and that history is inexorably working on their side. Unquestioning devotion to the interests of the Communist fatherland is, therefore, the one certain means of hastening revolution at home and elsewhere in the world; dissent to the voice of Moscow is of course the unpardonable sin to be punished by excommunication. Thus the inner history of Communism in America, since its origin in the historic schism in the Socialist Party after the foundation of the Third International, faithfully parodies the internal history of Communism in Russia. For similar reasons the methods and tactics of Communism in the United States are based not upon American but upon Russian revolutionary experience under the absolutism of the czars, which of course accounts for their highly conspiratorial character.

Throughout all the shifting policies and bewildering advances and retreats a certain strategy remains constant. The chief element in it is the destruction of all political life through the destruction of political parties, and especially of rival parties of the Left; and the principal device to this end, according to our historians, is penetration of the parties themselves and the popular front. This is why all organizations which have been lured into collaboration with Communists or have admitted them to membership soon become hopelessly divided, and of this the chief example cited, perhaps not without bitterness, by the Messrs. Oneal and Werner is that of the Socialist Party after 1932 under the ingenuous leadership of Mr. Norman Thomas. -- J. M. Lalley.

Mr. Lalley conducts a weekly book column in the Washington Post and contributes reviews to the New Yorker. He is the author of HUMAN EVENTS Pamphlet No. 4, Faith and Force, An Inquiry Into the Nature of Authority.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED